

Remarks/Arguments

By this Amendment, the Applicants hereby cancel Claims 60-62, 64, 66, 68-69 and 81-83 without prejudice or disclaimer. Further by this Amendment, the Applicants hereby amend Claims 54, 59, 63, 65, 67, 70, 72, 78-79, 84 and 88. Of these, Claims 59 and 88 have been rewritten as independent claims. Still further by this Amendment, the Applicants hereby add new Claims 89-94 for consideration by the Examiner. Accordingly, Claims 54-57, 59, 63, 65, 67, 70-80 and 84-94 are pending.

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Claims 54-57, 60-63, 65, 78-79 and 82-87 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,611,206 to Eshelman et al. Claims 59 and 88 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eshelman et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,412,708 to Katz. Finally, Claims 64, 66-67 and 80-81 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eshelman et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,421,080 to Lambert. In response, the Applicants respectfully traverse the various rejections of Claims 54-57 and 59-88 and instead submit that Claims 54-57, 59, 63, 65, 67, 70-80 and 84-88, as above amended, as well as newly added Claims 89-94 are neither taught nor suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the various rejections of Claims 54-57 and 59-88 and the allowance of Claims 54-57, 59, 63, 65, 67, 70-80 and 84-94.

The cited art has been carefully considered but neither teaches nor suggests Applicants' invention as claimed herein. More specifically, as to independent Claim 54, the cited art fails to teach or suggest a security gateway configured to capture and record (1) pre-alarm audiovisual information acquired by a first subset of a plurality of monitoring devices which are associated with a first sensor prior to the first sensor entering into an alarm condition, (2) post-alarm audio visual information acquired by the first subset of the plurality of monitoring devices subsequent to the first sensor entering into the alarm condition; and (3) non-alarm audiovisual information acquired by a second subset of the plurality of sensors which are associated with a second sensor

subsequent to the second sensor detecting a non-alarm event and prior to the first sensor entering into the alarm condition. Newly independent Claim 58 includes all of the foregoing distinctions over the cited art. In addition, as to Claim 58, the cited art neither teaches nor suggests a security gateway which further includes means for generating, in response to the streaming means streaming live video and/or audio data to a remote client, an audiovisual signal which notifies an occupant of the premises that the remote client is conducting remote monitoring of the premises.

As to independent Claim 63, the cited art neither teaches nor suggests a security gateway which includes a video module configured to (1) cache video data, received from first and second video cameras in a first memory; (2) store the cached video data received from the first video camera in a second memory in response to a first sensor, associated with the first video camera, detecting an alarm event and (3) store the cached video data received from the second video camera in the second memory in response to (a) the second sensor detecting a non-alarm event and (b) the first sensor detecting an alarm event within a pre-determined time period subsequent to the second sensor detecting the non-alarm event. In addition, as to newly added dependent Claim 91, the video module is further configured to discard, from the first memory, the cached video data relating to the second sensor detecting the non-alarm event in the event that the first sensor fails to detect an alarm event within the predetermined time period after the second sensor detects the non-alarm event.

As to independent Claim 78, the cited art neither teaches nor suggests a dual-use gateway suitable for use as part of both a security system and a lifestyle monitoring system in which, as part of the security monitoring usage of the dual-use gateway, the dual-use gateway stores video data received from a video camera. Further, as part of the lifestyle monitoring usage of the dual-use gateway, the dual-use gateway is configured to transmit a stream of substantially real-time video data to a remote console. As a further part of the lifestyle monitoring system, the remote security system server is prohibited from (1) accessing the video data stored by the dual-use gateway or (2) receiving the stream of substantially real-time video data until the dual-use gateway determines that an alarm condition exists. Finally as a further part of the security monitoring usage of the dual-use gateway, the remote console is prohibited from receiving the stream of substantially real-time video subsequent to the determination that an alarm condition

exists. Newly independent Claim 88 includes all of the foregoing distinctions over the cited art. In addition, as to Claim 88, the cited art neither teaches nor suggests a dual-use gateway which, as a further part of the lifestyle monitoring usage thereof, the dual-use gateway is further configured to generate, in response to the streaming of the substantially real-time video data to the remote client, a remote surveillance notification signal which notifies an occupant at the premises that the remote client is conducting remote monitoring of the premises.

For all the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 54-57, 59, 63, 65, 67, 70-80 and 84-88, as above amended, as well as newly added Claims 89-94 are neither taught nor suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the various rejections of Claims 54-57 and 59-88 and the allowance of Claims 54-57, 59, 63, 65, 67, 70-80 and 84-94.

A check for \$260.00 is enclosed to pay for the extension of time fee of \$60 and the excess claim fee of \$200.00 required in conjunction with the filing of this Communication. It is believed that there are no other fees associated with the filing of this Communication. However, in the event that there are other such fees, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 50-1515, Conley Rose, P.C.

This application is now in condition for allowance. A prompt Notice to that effect is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael S. Bush
Reg. No. 31,745
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS

Date: April 3, 2006

Conley Rose, P.C.
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Plano, Texas 74024-6616
(972) 731-2288 Telephone
(972) 731-2289 Facsimile